

sets him apart is his willingness to sacrifice time to lead in the establishment of programs such as the Glendale Coalition to Coordinate Emergency Food and Shelter, The Lords Kitchen, a feeding program for the homeless, Glendale Cold Weather Shelter, and a host of others. Because of his compassion, Dr. Roth has conducted numerous funerals for the homeless men and women. He is also highly respected member of several different boards, such as the Glendale Homeless Coalition and Positive Directions, a county funded Mental Health Drop-in Center.

Unfortunately, for those of us in the community we will miss Dr. Roth. As he departs for the Centerville Presbyterian Church in Fremont, CA, I would like to wish him, Marsha, and Amanda all the best as they move on. I am sure that they will have a strong and positive impact in Fremont as they have had here in Glendale.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1854) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, during consideration of this bill, we are fortunate that the House will have two good amendments to consider regarding what I consider to be one of the most ill-considered cuts in the bill—the elimination of the Office of Technology Assessment [OTA].

At a time when the Speaker talks constantly about the cyber-Congress and bringing this Congress into the space age of modern communication and the effective use of technology, one of the first steps as we take up this year's 13 annual appropriations bills is to eliminate the very agency—OTA—which gives Congress an independent capacity to analyze complex and technical issues.

My personal preference is that we simply restore OTA in its present form. My amendment does include a reduced funding level for OTA of 15 percent, in keeping with the cut applied to the General Accounting Office and other reductions in the bill. Certainly, OTA should not be immune to legislative downsizing.

However, I also think our colleague, AMO HOUGHTON, has offered a thoughtful amendment that would essentially abolish OTA but hold on to its core function and its core staff by moving them to become a new component of Congressional Research Service. I think this approach has much to commend it. In fact, 10 percent of OTA's annual budget goes to pay for its leased space. If we could just move OTA into a Federal office building like House Annex No. 2 or another appropriate Federal facility, we could recoup that cost as well as a number of administrative costs associated with maintaining OTA's facilities.

Although I would prefer to leave OTA alone, the Houghton amendment, making a 32-percent cut in OTA's regular budget, is probably

the best long-range solution for retaining OTA's important mission while allowing it to be carried on as cost-effectively as possible in keeping with overall legislative branch reductions. I intend to support his approach.

For my colleagues who may not be as familiar with OTA as some of their seniors, perhaps an introduction is necessary. OTA is a bipartisan organization analyzing science and technology issues in depth for Congress, primarily for House and Senate committees.

OTA is a bipartisan organization. For example, last year, OTA issued 21 major reports, and 85 percent of them were requested on a bipartisan basis. The reports are begun only after OTA's congressional governing board, which has an equal number of Republicans and Democrats, gives the green light to proceed. The Board also reviews all reports for bias before they are released.

Although OTA is a small agency with only 143 full-time employees and an annual budget for fiscal year 1995 of about \$22 million, we get a tremendous bang for our buck because OTA draws on the expertise of over 5,000 outside-the-beltway specialists from industry, academia, and other institutions each year in contributing to its reports and its policy recommendations.

OTA is a lean, cost-effective organization. Since 1993, OTA voluntarily has reduced its middle and senior management by almost 40 percent. OTA relies wherever possible on the use of temporary expert technical staff to avoid adding to its spartan number of full-time employees.

The most important thing to know about OTA is that it saves taxpayer dollars. Again and again, OTA analyses have been the basis for wise policy decisions as Congress formulates legislation. Here are just a few examples:

First, OTA's reports on health care services have saved taxpayers billions by analyzing which medical treatments are cost-effective for inclusion under Medicare and which are not.

Second, OTA's study of the computers at the Social Security Administration last year saved an estimated \$368 million.

Third, OTA's cautions about the Synthetic Fuels Corporation saved an estimated \$60 billion in spending for energy research.

Fourth, OTA's study of technologies permitted FAA to choose the most cost-effective explosion detection device standards for airline safety.

Fifth, OTA's recommendations concerning the electric power industry contributed greatly to deregulation of the electric power industry as part of the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

In the past few days, we have each received several impressive bipartisan Dear Colleague letters that tell about the special role played by OTA. CURT WELDON and JOHN SPRATT, the chair and ranking member of the Military Research and Development Subcommittee of the National Security Committee respectively, told us how, in response to the bombing in Oklahoma City, they had occasion to draw on OTA's work about countering terrorism. They said their committee has drawn on OTA work on such topics as the former Soviet Union and proliferation, preserving a robust defense technology and industrial base, and evaluating the potential for using a dual-use strategy to meet defense needs. WELDON and SPRATT concluded by saying, "The type of work they perform is just not available from other congressional agencies."

JOHN DINGELL and JIM McDERMOTT told us of OTA's importance in evaluating Medicare, rural health care, pharmaceutical research and development, and tough issues like defensive medicine and medical malpractice, unconventional cancer treatments, forensic DNA testing, and other very technical issues related to health. "Time and time again," they said, "OTA reports have provided the timely information necessary for Congress to make good policy decisions to spend federal health care dollars well."

MIKE OXLEY, chair of the Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade, and Hazardous Materials, and RICK BOUCHER, a Democratic member of that subcommittee, brought our attention to OTA's work on environment issues before their subcommittee including Superfund, nuclear contamination in the Arctic Ocean, alternatives to incineration for cleaning up selected Superfund sites, and new biological pesticides.

A letter from our colleague GEORGE BROWN, the former chairman of the Science Committee, and others cited a small sample of the leaders from business and industry, science and academic who believe the committee made a mistake in trying to eliminate OTA.

Leaders from business and industry endorsing OTA include Norman Augustine, the president of Lockheed-Martin; David Potter, former vice chairman of General Motors Corp.; Doug Decker of Johnston Controls; Robert Klimish, vice president of the American Automobile Manufacturers Association; John Seely Brown from the Xerox Palo Alto Research Center; Michel T. Halbouty, president of America's largest independent oil company; David Hale, chief economist for Kemper Financial Services; Mitch Kapor, chairman, of ON Technologies Inc. and the inventor of Lotus 1-2-3; John Diebold of the Diebold Institute for Public Policy Studies, Inc.; Brooks Ragen, chairman and CEO of Ragen McKenzie; and Jim Christy from TRW.

Scientists and academics endorsing OTA include Sally Ride, America's first woman astronaut; Guy Stever, Science Advisor to Presidents Ford and Carter; Ed David, Science Advisor to President Nixon; Charles Vest, president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Jim Hunt, former chancellor of the University of Tennessee Medical Center; Harold Brown, former president of Caltech and former Secretary of Defense under President Carter; Robert Frosch of the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University; Granger Morgan and Marvin Sirbu from Carnegie-Mellon University; Daniel Bell of the American Academy of Arts & Sciences; George Connick, president of the Education Network at the University of Maine; John Dutton, Dean of Earth Sciences at Pennsylvania State University; Rosemary Stevens of the University of Pennsylvania; Chase Peterson, president emeritus of the University of Utah; Max Lennon, past president of Clemson University; Alvin L. Alm of Science Applications International Inc.

Other supporters include our most eminent scientific organizations: the American Association for the Advancement of Science; the National Academy of Sciences; the Federation of American Scientists; the American Physical Society; the American Association of Medical Colleges; and American Psychological Association.

The Dear Colleague letter pointed out that technology offices modeled after OTA have

been established by the parliaments of England, France, Germany, the Netherlands, and the European Commission. Clearly, OTA has a national and international reputation for excellence.

Coming from a State where agriculture is of pre-eminent importance, I am struck by the number of important analyses OTA has provided in the agriculture area, a policy area where one might not normally think of complex or highly technical issues. For nearly 20 years, OTA has provided exceptional support on agriculture technology and policy to Congress. As we begin the Farm Bill debate this year, we are already armed with a major, new assessment from the agency—"Agriculture, Trade and the Environment"—which presents several ways to achieve trade growth and environmental quality in complementary fashion.

OTA is completing another study using the best scientific expertise available in the country to identify agriculture's environmental priorities for better targeting of the Conservation Reserve Program and others under continuing budget stress. In a second study, OTA is assessing ways that agricultural research can generate new technologies at a faster pace, so as to ensure continued growth in trade while still meeting environmental, food safety, and public health goals. Another assessment now underway examines the roles biologically based pest controlled technologies can play in reducing the risk and use of pesticides while maintaining competitiveness. This subject affects several farm bill titles, including research, technology transfer, and land management.

In closing, I'll emphasize several points. First, it is imperative that Congress retain an independent analytical function. We don't want to rely on executive branch agencies.

Second, OTA's work cannot be picked up adequately by GAO or CRS, which focus on entirely different types of studies. The idea that OTA's work somehow could be contracted out is also unworkable. We would either be beholden to organizations supplying studies slanted to their own interests, or if we were willing to pay top dollar for the type of long-range studies OTA now undertakes, we would lose the important capacity inherent in an established professional staff to give testimony or to assist with legislative proposals sometimes years after the studies have been completed.

Third, policy questions are increasingly complex and technical. Environmental risk assessment and telecommunications are just two examples of complicated policy issues that confront Congress this year. Our colleagues have pointed out many others in the areas of national security, health, agriculture, and the environment. We make important policy choices every day, and we need OTA to help us sort out fact from fiction.

I ask my colleagues to support the Fazio and the Houghton amendments to restore OTA and to hold on to the important mission of this agency in support of our congressional decision-making.

TRIBUTE TO ANDREW G. CANGEMI

HON. MICHAEL P. FORBES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1995

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, it is no coincidence that Andrew G. Cangemi is the 1995 recipient of the Mental Health Association's Community Service Award at an event honoring Clinton Court. Mr. Cangemi exemplifies how one individual, like one new living option for people with a history of mental illness, can make all the difference in the world.

On a daily basis, Andy Cangemi touches many lives. Andy serves as an associate vice president of the Nassau County Council, Boy Scouts of America, and is a member of its board of directors. In 1994 he received the distinguished Citizen Award from the Scouts. He has received citations from the county of Nassau, towns of Huntington, Hempsted, and Islip for his work in the community. He particularly enjoys his volunteer work with the Northport Youth Soccer League.

As president of the Advancement for Commerce and Industry, a business organization of several hundred members, he has worked tirelessly to promote a working partnership between government and business to revitalize economic, environmental, and social conditions on Long Island.

As a partner in Sigel, Fenchel & Peddy, P.C. he is a member of both the Nassau and Suffolk Bar Associations. He is active in the Nassau County Judicial Advisory Council, the Columbian Lawyers Society, and the Sons of Italy. He has served as chairman of the Nassau County Bar Association's Condemnation and Tax Certiorari Committee, and as a lecturer for the Nassau Academy of Law.

Andy Cangemi's inspiration and vitality flows out of his background. As a neighborhood boy from Brooklyn, he considers himself fortunate to work his way up and have had the opportunity to become a practicing attorney. His interests in community services is an expression of the great responsibility he feels to give back. The energy he devotes represents a coming together of the personal and the professional man.

I've had the privilege of being a part of many important initiatives on Long Island, and I am proud to help MHA build Clinton Court. This project will be a model for affordable housing that will enable people with psychiatric disabilities to become productive, independent members of our community.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to know Andy Cangemi and I am proud today to be able to commemorate his many accomplishments. He is an example of the best of Long Island and of this Nation, a hard-working man who gives his time tirelessly to those less fortunate than himself. He demonstrates that in today's busy world compassion is still possible and relevant.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1854) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, the rule for this bill is frequently controversial because the provisions of the legislative appropriations bill affect our personal offices, our committees, and the offices and people supporting this institution. We all have personal knowledge of much of the subject matter, but there are many different perspectives about the standards we should be setting for ourselves and the way we should be administering the House. Those perspectives ensure controversy, and as the floor manager of the legislative appropriations bill for the last 13 years, I've managed my share of them. That honor now falls to my good friend, RON PACKARD, as the new chairman of the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee.

This year 33 amendments were offered to the Rules Committee—however, only 11 were accepted.

The structure of this rule stands in stark contrast to the open rule adopted for consideration of the military construction appropriations bill, which was considered immediately prior to this one.

Although some good questions will be debated today, I am troubled by the important subjects that will be skipped.

Thoughtful amendments were submitted on a number of issues affecting the way we conduct business here. Amendments were submitted including:

First, ensuring the frequent flier miles earned by Government travel will only be applied to Government travel,

Second, eliminating funding for the Joint Economic Committee, and

Third, eliminating the discrepancy between congressional retirement benefits and other congressional employees.

I'm particularly concerned that the Republican majority on the Rules Committee voted down three amendments to the rule offered by their Democratic counterparts:

First, the Brewster/Harman lockbox amendment—this is a good concept that has been endorsed overwhelmingly by the House in the past. It's too bad we won't have a chance to consider it again when it comes to cuts in our won backyard.

Second, an amendment offered by Mrs. SCHROEDER to abolish the Joint Tax Committee. Mrs. SCHROEDER made a good argument at the Rules Committee comparing the Republican attitude toward the Select Committees of Hunger, Narcotics, Aging, and Children, Youth and Families—which were eliminated at the beginning of this Congress—and whether we should be considering joint tax in this same vein. Unfortunately, the House won't have a chance to make the comparison.

Third, last but hardly least, a gift ban proposed by our freshman colleague, JOHN